

Welcome



Forest Plan Public Meeting

Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit

**The Webinar will begin at
1pm Pacific**



Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit





Welcome



Opening Remarks

Jeff Marsolais

Deputy Forest Supervisor, LTBMU





Welcome



Overview Presenters:

Mike LeFevre – Planning Staff Officer

Denise Downie – Forest Plan IDT Co-Leader (Forest Soil Scientist)

Matt Dickinson - Forest Plan IDT Co-Leader (NEPA Contract
Coordinator)





Agenda



Overview Presentation – 20 min

4 Presentations – 5 min introduction/10 min questions

- **Watershed**
- **Forest Vegetation & Fuels**
- **Recreation & Access**
- **Biological Resources**

Key Differences

- Alternatives
- Consequences





Purpose of Presentations



- Where are we now?
- Overview of the draft Plan documents
- Highlight key differences in Alternatives
- Where are we going?





Forest Plans



National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA)

- Every National Forest has a land management plan
- Forest Plans govern activities and uses on NFS lands

Forest Service Planning Regulations (2012 Planning Rule)

- Require EIS (compliant with NEPA)

LTBMU Forest Plan

- 1988 Plan, amended 2004 SNFPA (Framework) & 2007 MIS
- 2013 - Revised Plan replaces old plan and amendments





Forest Plans



Forest Service trending toward strategic Forest Plans

- Revised Forest Plan less prescriptive than current Plan
- Desired Conditions – Future outcomes

Provides overall guidance and direction

- All projects, activities, and uses must be consistent

Detailed management direction is at project or permit level

- Project level NEPA analysis





Where are we?



Released Draft Land & Resource Mgmt Plan – June 1st

- ☐ Draft Environmental Impact Statement

 - ❖ *4 Alternatives*

- ☐ Draft Plan (Alt B)

- ☐ Appendix & Maps



Public Information Meetings – July 17th & 18th

Webinar – July 19th

Comment Period ends – Aug 30th





DEIS – Alternative Development



- Public scoping input: 2004 - 2011
 - Compliant with Law, Reg. & Policy
 - Viable, achievable, realistic
 - Strategic not site-specific
-

- **4 Alternatives proposed**

- Alts considered but eliminated from study





DEIS Alternatives



- **A** – *No Action* – Current management under existing plan as amended and implemented. Includes 2004 SNFPA (Framework) amendment.
- **B** – *Draft Plan/Preferred* – Management similar to current but responds to present management direction and science such as climate change. Allows slight increase in developed recreation facilities. No wilderness recommendations, retains existing IRAs. No significant changes in road and trail system access.





DEIS Alternatives



- **C** – More intensive approach to fuels management, allows modest increase in recreation facilities, recommends Dardanelles IRA for wilderness. Allows shift in road and trail system to accommodate easier access.
- **D** – Passive management emphasis relying on natural processes, allows slight decrease in recreation facilities, recommends Dardanelles and Freel IRAs for wilderness. Road and trail system is managed for more primitive and challenging access.

* All alternatives retain 1999 recommendation for Upper Truckee River “wild” river designation (7 mile segment)





DEIS – Management Areas



Wilderness – Desolation, Mt. Rose & Granite Chief

Backcountry – Inventoried Roadless Areas

General Conservation – Roaded landscapes, WUI, recreation sites (resorts, ski areas)

Santini-Burton/Urban Forest Parcels – Acquired lands with special legislative direction





DEIS Consequences



- Disclose the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of each Alternative for each resource
- How we measured the effect, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences
- Based on Best Available Science and professional expertise
- *Learn more at the Information Stations*





DEIS Assumptions



- All law, policy, plan direction is followed and effective
- 15 year planning horizon
- Budget –constant or declining (*not increasing*)
- Wilderness recommendations will be adopted by Congress (Alts C & D)
- Visitation will mimic US Census trends (increase about 1.4% annually)
- Climate Change – Described in CC Section, each Resource, Appendix D





DEIS Assumptions



On-going projects will be completed as planned

- Currently in implementation
- Funded for planning or implementation
- Decision has been documented in NEPA analysis

Current projects will be completed over next 5-10 years





Where are we going?



Draft EIS comment period – 90 days, ends August 30th

Prepare Response to Comments

- IDT reviews all comments – CAT assistance
- PSW Research Station – Convene Independent Science Review
- OGC - Legal Review
- USFWS Consultation
- Tribal Consultation



Final EIS/Preferred Alternative – early 2013

Objection Period – 60 days (+ 90 day resolution period)

Record of Decision – Revised Plan effective fall 2013





Effective Comment Tips



Effective

- Clear, concise, and relevant to the level of analysis
- Explain what you think we got right or not right and why
- Focus on alternatives, and the assessment of the consequences
- Based on factual information - not hearsay

Not so effective

- Simply stating opposition without a reason, or resolution
- Stating generic positions e.g. “protect water quality”
- Repetitive comments without rationale
- Unsupported statements that proposal will have “significant environmental effects” without relevant cause and effect.





Information Stations



Forest Vegetation/Fuels

- *Randy Striplin* - Fire Ecologist

Biological Resources

- *Holly Eddinger* – Biological Program Ldr.

Recreation, Wilderness & Access

- *Bob Becker* - Recreation Specialist
- *Jonathan Cook-Fisher* – SU Program Mgr.
- *Garrett Villanueva* - Asst. Forest Engineer
- *Mike Gabor* – Forest Engineer

Joey Keely – Ecosystems Conservation Staff Officer

Watershed

- *Sue Norman* - Physical Science Group Ldr





Fire, Fuels & Forest Vegetation



Randy Striplin – Fire Ecologist



Alternatives – Forest Vegetation, Fuels, and Fire Management



Alternative A (No Action) – 1988 Plan as amended

- Continue treatments as currently planned.
- Allow wildfire managed for resource objectives only in Desolation Wilderness.

Alternative B (Draft Plan)

- Outside of Wilderness, use thinning, prescribed fire, small openings to restore resilience, diverse structure, and promote desired species composition.
- Allows exceptions to diameter limits under specific conditions.
- Canopy cover requirements retained only for PACs and HRCAs to better manage for structural diversity.
- Allow wildfire managed for resource objectives on all NFS lands except WUI Defense Zone.



Alternatives – Forest Vegetation, Fuels, and Fire Management



Alternative C

- Resiliency, structure and species composition strategies similar to Alternative B except increase treatment acres and further reduce stand density.
- Exceptions to diameter limits and canopy cover requirements similar to Alternative B.
- Allow wildfire managed for resource objectives on all NFS lands except WUI Defense and Threat Zones.

Alternative D

- Resiliency, structure and species composition strategies similar to Alternative A, but greater emphasis on use of prescribed fire and wildfire managed for resource objectives .
- Most restrictive diameter limits. Canopy cover requirements as in Alternative A.
- Allow wildfire managed for resource objectives on all NFS lands except WUI Defense Zone.



Consequences – Forest Vegetation, Fuels, and Fire Management



Alternative A (No Action) – 1988 Plan as amended

- Canopy reduction restrictions, diameter limits, and limits on wildfire managed for resource objectives constrain ability to:
- Promote surface fire type in WUI
- Restore fire to landscape using prescribed fire and managed wildfire
- Enhance stand succession to late seral conditions
- Moderate opportunity to restore forest structure and composition by creating openings.

Alternative B (Draft Plan)

- Fewer canopy cover restrictions and diameter limits, along with greatest area available for wildfire managed for resource objectives provide increased flexibility over Alt. A to:
- Promote surface fire type in WUI
- Restore fire to landscape using prescribed fire and managed wildfire.
- Enhance stand succession to late seral conditions.
- Provides objectives to restore forest structure and composition by creating openings.



Consequences – Forest Vegetation, Fuels, and Fire Management



Alternative C

- Similar to Alt. B except treats more acres to lower residual density and provides less area for wildfire managed for resource objectives
- Greatest ability to enhance stand succession to late seral conditions because competition for resources is minimized.

Alternative D

- Greatest treatment restrictions and over-reliance on fire as primary tool provide least amount of flexibility to:
- Promote surface fire type in WUI
- Enhance stand succession to late seral conditions.
- Area available for wildfire managed for resource objectives same as Alt. B, but over-reliance on unpredictable conditions need to meet objectives using prescribed fire and managed wildfire make this the most risky alternative (i.e., all eggs are in one basket).



Biological Resources



Holly Eddinger – Forest Biological Program Leader



Alternatives – Biological Resources



Alternative A (No Action) – 1988 Plan as amended

- Continue current managing Protected activity centers (PACs), home range core areas (HRCAs), critical aquatic refuges (CARs) and Federal Threatened and Endangered Species (TES).
- Stream channel restoration driven by water quality.
- Continue terrestrial invasive management, no direction for AIS.

Alternative B (Draft Plan) and Alternative C

- Species Refuge Areas (SRA) adopted which expands CAR concept to include terrestrial species; opportunity to restore PACs and HRCAs.
- Stream channel restoration driven by water quality and species habitat objectives.
- Adds specific direction for aquatic invasive species (AIS). .
- Integration of fuels, vegetation, and TES habitat management.
- Seek opportunities to restore SRAs and native species habitat
- Forest, meadow, wetland management emphasizes resiliency to climate change.



Alternatives – Biological Resources



Alternative D

- Greater emphasis on natural processes, passive management.
- Restoration limited to removal of stressors (e.g. fish barriers).
- Invasive species management focused on high priority species.
- PAC/ HRCA management same as Alternative A.



Consequences – Biological Resources



Alternative A (No Action) – 1988 Plan as amended

- TES species, CARs, PACs and HRCAs are maintained where they occur; Potential for PAC and HRCA habitat deterioration.
- Recreation expansion may result in habitat degradation and increased risk of AIS transference.
- Potential habitat deterioration from limited vegetation.

Alternative B (Draft Plan)

- SRAs improve management of select species and restoration beyond CARS; PAC and HRCA habitat improvement from restoration.
- Recreation expansion may result in habitat degradation; associated AIS risk reduced by consistent guidance.
- Potential for positive trend in SEZ and forest condition from forest health treatments tailored to Basin desired condition.



Consequences – Biological Resources



Alternative C

- Consequences similar to B but greater potential for indirect effects from recreation expansion and more aggressive fuels treatments.

Alternative D

- PAC/HRCA consequences same as described for A.
- Potential for improved habitat where recreation sites reduced.
- Potential degradation from forest health treatment limitations and lack of restoration.
- Invasive (AIS and terrestrial species) risk increases.



Recreation and Access



Bob Becker – Recreation Specialist

Garrett Villanueva – Assistant Forest Engineer



Alternatives – Recreation and Access



Alternative A (No Action) – 1988 Plan as amended

- Maintain existing developed recreation and allow expansion at identified locations.
- Retain current Wilderness and Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs).
- Continue current management of roads and trails.
- Promote transit use by connecting transit infrastructure with trails.
- Maintain current parking capacity and apply BMPs to adopted parking areas .

Alternative B (Draft Plan)

- Maintain existing developed recreation and allow up to 5% expansion .
- Retain current Wilderness and Inventoried Roadless Areas
- Slight increase in roads open to passenger vehicles.
- Routes open to OHV and mechanized use similar to Alternative A.
- Promote transit use by connecting transit infrastructure with trails.
- Maintain current parking capacity by adopting unmanaged sites; eliminate roadside parking.



Alternatives – Recreation and Access



Alternative C

- Maintain existing developed recreation and allow up to 15% expansion.
- Recommend Dardanelles IRA for Wilderness designation.
- Slight decrease in trails open to mechanized use (e.g. mountain bikes).
- Greatest increase in roads open to passenger vehicles.
- Slight increase in trails open to OHV use. Greatest ability to provide infrastructure to promote transit use.
- Increase parking capacity (managed parking).

Alternative D

- No expansion of developed recreation; recreation infrastructure lost due to ecological restoration, financial constraints, or resource conflicts would not be replaced.
- Recommend Dardanelles and Freel IRAs for Wilderness designation; additional backcountry acres.
- Greatest decrease in trails open to mechanized use.
- Decrease in roads open to passenger vehicles.
- Increase in roads open to OHV; slight decrease in trails open to OHV.
- Least ability to provide infrastructure to promote transit use.
- Least parking; fewest sites adopted for managed parking.



Consequences – Recreation and Access



Alternative A (No Action) – 1988 Plan as amended

- Opportunity to increase visitor capacity at developed recreation sites.
- No change in Wilderness and Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA) status.
- Continuation of current road and trail management and Over Snow Vehicle (OSV) use.

Alternative B (Draft Plan)

- Opportunity to increase visitor capacity at developed recreation sites, but less than Alternative A.
- No change in Wilderness and Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA) status.
- Continuation of current road and trail management and OSV use similar to Alternative A.



Consequences – Recreation and Access



Alternative C

- Greatest opportunities to increase visitor capacity at developed recreation sites.
- Increased opportunity for wilderness experience if Dardanelles IRA is designated by Congress.
- Wilderness designation of Dardanelles IRA would result in the loss of some popular mountain biking routes.
- More passenger vehicle use; fewer roads available for OHV (street legal); Areas open to OSV use same as A.

Alternative D

- Potential for decreased visitor capacity at developed recreation sites.
- Greatest opportunity for Wilderness experience if Dardanelles and Freel IRAs receive Wilderness designation; additional backcountry acres add to opportunities for wilderness experience.
- Wilderness designation of Dardanelles and Freel IRAs would result in the loss of some popular mountain biking routes.
- Wilderness designation of Freel IRA would decrease the areas open to OSV use.
- Less passenger vehicle use due to less access; more roads available for OHV (green sticker).



Watershed



Sue Norman – Physical Sciences Group Leader



Alternatives – Watershed



Alternative A (No Action) – 1988 Plan as amended

- Protect, enhance, and restore soil and water quality.
- Continue active stream channel and aquatic habitat restoration through currently planned projects.
- Potential additional restoration projects as needed.

Alternative B (Draft Plan)

- Same as Alternative A.



Alternatives – Watershed



Alternative C

- Same as Alternatives A and B.

Alternative D

- Protect, enhance, and restore soil and water quality.
- After completion of currently planned projects, rely on natural processes for recovery.
- No additional active restoration projects; may implement passive restoration limited to removal of stressors.



Consequences – Watershed



Alternative A (No Action) – 1988 Plan as amended

- TMDL milestones achieved; no additions to 303d (impaired) stream list
- Watershed condition class is maintained or improved.
- Groundwater and surface water resources protected and enhanced; Soil quality maintained at a sustainable level.
- Measurable improvement in stream channel geomorphic stability and floodplain connectivity.

Alternative B (Draft Plan)

- Same as Alternative A.



Consequences – Watershed



Alternative C

- Same as Alternatives A and B.

Alternative D

- Achievement of long term (15+ years) TMDL milestones may be delayed
- Watershed condition similar to A for 10-15 years; greater risk of inability to maintain or improve watershed condition class.
- Short term improvements to stream channels and floodplains, but less than A, B, and C in long term.



Further Information



<http://www.fs.usda.gov/goto/lbmu/ForestPlanRevision>

Email: comments-pacificsouthwest-lbmu@fs.fed.us

Subject: Draft Land Management Plan

Denise Downie 530 543-2683

Matt Dickinson 530 543-2769